DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 731 CS 506 575

AUTHOR Seiter, John S.; Waddell, Debra
TITLE The Intercultural Reentry Process: Reentry Shock, Locus of Control, Satisfaction, and Interpersonal Uses of Communication.
PUB DATE Feb 89
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Spokane, WA, February 17-21, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Culture Conflict; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Locus of Control; Questionnaires; *Reentry Students; Social Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Cultural Values

ABSTRACT

A study examined American college and university students' successful reentry, hypothesized to be influenced by their locus of control for affiliation, interpersonal uses for communication, and relational satisfaction. The subjects, 54 returned sojourners (i.e., students who had studied abroad), filled out a questionnaire to measure reentry shock and relational satisfaction. Subjects were also given questionnaires measuring their locus of control for affiliation beliefs and their interpersonal uses for communication. Correlations among the data indicated that: (1) reentry shock was not associated with internal or external locus of control; (2) locus of control beliefs for affiliation was moderately associated with uses for communication; and (3) internal and external locus of control were associated with various uses of communication. A negative correlation was found between reentry shock and relational satisfaction. Results indicated that reentry was not associated with either internal or external locus of control in this study and that reentry shock can lead to improved interpersonal skills, improved relationships with family members, and even increased intrapersonal knowledge. (Two tables of data are included, and 29 references are attached.) (RAE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304731

The Intercultural Reentry Process: Reentry Shock; Locus of Control; Satisfaction; and Interpersonal Uses of Communication

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John Seiter
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

by

John S. Seiter

and

Debra Waddell

Department of Speech Communication
California State University, Fullerton
Fullerton, CA 92634
(714) 773-3617

Paper submitted to the Intercultural Interest Group for the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Spokane Washington, February, 1989.

The authors would like to express our gratitude to Dr. Daniel Canary and Dr. Richard Wiseman for their assistance in data analysis, and to Dr. Rebecca Rubin for her assistance in data collection.

CS506575

The Intercultural Reentry Process: Reentry Shock; Locus of Control; Satisfaction; and Interpersonal Uses of Communication

ABSTRACT

American students' successful reentry is hypothesized to be influenced by their locus of control for affiliation, interpersonal uses for communication, and relational satisfaction. A questionnaire to measure reentry shock and relational satisfaction was developed and administered to 54 returned sojourners. Subjects were also given questionnaires measuring their locus of control for affiliation beliefs (Lefcourt, 1981) and their interpersonal uses for communication (Rubin et al, 1987). Correlations among the data indicated that (1) reentry shock was not associated with internal or external locus of control, (2) locus of control beliefs for affiliation was moderately associated with uses for communication, (3) internal and external locus of control were associated with various uses of communication, and (4) a negative correlation was found between reentry shock and relational satisfaction. Results of the study and implications for future research are discussed.

Introduction

While culture shock has received much attention by researchers examining the process of cultural adjustment, social scientists have only recently examined the similar adjustment difficulties experienced by individuals returning to their home culture after having lived abroad for some time. Contemporary psychologists, anthropologists, and intercultural communication scholars have called these difficulties in readjusting to one's own culture reentry shock. Friedman (1986) explained that reentry shock results when sojourners return home and discover that they cannot pick up where they left off. They discover that their friends, family, and associates have changed and no longer fit the mental image that the sojourners' have of them. While literature and systematic research in the area of reentry shock is increasing, several researchers agree that the need to explore the reentry process still exsists (Brein & David, 1971; Gama & Pedersen, 1977; Martin, 1984; Uehara, 1986).

Martin (1986) has argued that new research especially needs to focus on the returning sojourners' communication. This study investigates American students' reentry through both an examination of their locus of control for affiliation, and their interpersonal uses for communication. The objective of this study is to further scientific understanding of the reentry process by exploring the possible relationships among intercultural reentry shock, locus of control, interpersonal uses of communication, and communication satisfaction. First, an analysis of the literature will be used to formulate hypotheses. Second, methods used to obtain the data and the results will be presented. Finally, results of the data in light of previous research will be discussed.

Review of the literature

The process of intercultural reentry is described in several different ways, but most research notes that the reentry process is a difficult and stressful period for the returning sojourner. Uehara (1986) describes reentry shock as a period when the sojourner experiences "psychosocial difficulties (sometimes associated with physical problems)" (p.416) upon returning home after living abroad for some time. Furthermore, several studies suggest that the reentry process is more difficult than the initial entry into a foreign culture (Austin, 1983; Martin, 1984). Upon returning home, sojourners often find that the values and beliefs that they assimilated while in the foreign culture conflict with what is accepted in their home culture. Conflicts between cultural values, symbols, behaviors, and rules of the host and home cultures are perhaps the most agreed upon cause of culture shock and reentry shock (Austin, 1986; Brein & David, 1971; Gama & Pederson, 1977; Uehara, 1986).

While the recognition of these conflicts by the returnee is one cause of reentry shock, a second cause is the pressure that can be exerted by those from the home culture. Freedman (1986) explained that in order to feel comfortable, individuals have the need to predict the behavior of others. Because returnees' behavior has changed and is unpredictable, family and friends exert pressure on the returnee to, once again, behave in predictable ways. This pressure can result in the increased stress which is a part of reentry shock. Furthermore, the returning sojourners' anxiety is intensified because they can no longer predict the behavior of those from the home culture (Freedman, 1986).

As most studies on reentry focus on the problems that sojourners

experience when returning home, there is much evidence for the fact that intercultural reentry is a stessful time. Jansson (1986) explained that the reentry process is slow, painful and often terrifying. Problems occuring during reentry can be psychological and/or physical. Church (1982) explained that psychological problems include irritablity, impatience, depression, anxiety, helplessness, and anger. Uehara (1986) listed feelings of apathy, loss, and loneliness as possible psychological ramifications, explaining that these psychological difficulties are sometimes associated with physical problems. Some of the physical problems reported by researchers include loss of appetite, sleeping disorders, and minor pains (Church, 1982). Thus, it is clear that reentry shock can result in serious physical and psychological problems for the returning sojourner.

Because the reentry process is often characterized by high levels of stress for sojourners, a consideration of variables affecting stress levels could prove beneficial in understanding the reentry contruct. There has been much work examining individual differences that account for variations in the way that individuals cope with stressors in their lives. Lefcourt(1981) suggests that the relationship between life stress events and emotional or physical health can be moderated by the locus of control contruct. According to research in this area, an important determinant of the effects of life change may be whether stressful events are perceived as being within or outside the control of the individual (Johnson & Sarason, 1978). If this is so, then examining a returning sojourners' locus of control orientation may reveal information directly pertinent to the ability to adjust during the reentry process.

Research in locus of control orientation maintains that individuals differ

in the degree to which they perceive environmental reinforcers (rewards) as being under their personal control. Individuals with an internal locus of control perceive that the resultant event is contingent upon their own behavior, while individuals with an external locus of control perceive the resultant event to be the result of fate, chance, luck, or powerful others (Rotter, 1966). Using stress responses as an example, Kobasa's (1979) study argues that individuals with particular locus of control orientations handle stress differently. An individual with an internal locus of control sees himself or herself as "not just the victim of a threatening change, but as an active determinant of the consequences it brings about" (p.9). An individual who is more internally oriented would hold himself or herself more responsible for particular outcomes than an externally oriented individual (Lefcourt, Hogg, Struthers, and Holmes,1975). By contrast, individuals with an external locus of control perceive the stressful change as something that "has been externally determined with no possibility of control on his part" (Kobasa, p.9). Furthermore, Lefcourt et al. found that externals seem more uncomfortable when encountering adversity than do internals.These orientations seem to affect individuals' response to stress in their lives. Johnson and Sarason (1978), for example, found that individuals who experienced high levels of change but felt no control over events were most susceptible to the effects of stress (both psychologically, and physically). Additionally, Kobasa (1979) obtained similar results: individuals with an internal locus of control perceive change as less personally stressful than individuals with an external locus of control. In view of the relationship between locus of control beliefs and stress response, it is possible that if reentry is perceived as stressful by the

returning sojourner, there may be a relationship between locus of control beliefs, and intercultural reentry. Consistent with research in both locus of control and reentry shock we postulate our first two hypotheses:

H_1: Internal locus of control for affiliation is associated with decreases in reentry shock.

H_2: External locus of control for affiliation is associated with increases in reentry shock.

Extending this line of reasoning, it is possible that communication may serve different functions for individuals based on their locus of control beliefs. The current research examining the functions of communication is clearly explicated in a literature review in Rubin, Perse, and Barbato (1987). Consistent with their argument that empirical research "has not yet examined these communication motives" (p.1), the majority of studies presented on this topic are theoretical in orientation. More empirical in orientation, Schutz (1966) has developed instruments to measure individuals' functions based on theory arguing that individuals have three basic interpersonal needs: inclusion, control, and affection. These instruments measure individual intitiated and other initiated behavior of an individual in these three areas. Rubin et al.'s (1987) study melds research in interpersonal communication and mass communication to produce an instrument which measures the functions of interpersonal communication. Their study, which used the three constructs Schutz conceptualized, confirmed Schutz's assertion that individuals use communication to fullfill needs of affection, inclusion, and control. Additionally, individuals were found to use communication for pleasure, escape, and relaxation.

Individuals' locus of control for affiliation beliefs suggest expectencies

that individuals have about interactions which directly affect the way they use communication. Because these seem to assert a relationship between functions of communication and locus of control beliefs, the third hypothesis of this study postulates:

H_3: Individuals' locus of control for affiliation beliefs are associated with particular functions of communication.

The overall argument in Rubin et. al.(1986) is that communication is used by individuals to fulfill certain needs. During the reentry process not only do sojourners discover that the home environment has changed, but through interaction with others in the home environment, they discover they too have changed (Koester, 1983). It is through communication that individuals readapt to the "once familiar environment" (Martin, 1984, p.6) and reestablish patterns of prior relationships. As mentioned earlier, it is probable that the entire home environment has changed. Research has revealed that variables that have been found to affect adjustment do so because they influence the sojourner's amount of social interaction (Brein & David, 1971; Martin, 1986). Because communication plays such a major role in the reentry process, perhaps communication affects the success with which one reenters his or her native culture. It is possible that the returning sojourner may be using communication to achieve something in particular (e.g. meet particular interpersonal needs). The fourth hypothesis explores this possibility:

H_4: Reentry shock is associated with particular interpersonal uses of communication.

The issue of relational satisfaction comes into focus because although reentry shock may be associated with the particular motivation that

sojourners have for communication, sojourners are returning to a "web of relationships" (Martin, 1984, p.7) which constitute a large part of the home environment. Many studies suggest that, for the returning sojourner, the change in these relationships is a major source of problems. Uehara's study (cited in Martin, 1984) reported a negative relationship between reentry shock, and relational satisfaction. The more dissatisfied sojourners are with their relationships, the more reentry problems they report. Additionally, Martin (1984) reports relational success as differentiating satisfied and unsatisfied returning sojourners. These studies seem to support the results of earlier work examining reentry shock and interpersonal relationships (Gama & Pederson, 1977; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963). The final hypothesis postulated focuses on this relationship:

H_5: Reentry shock is negatively associated with relational satisfaction.

Method

Sample

Two lists of students whom had returned from studying abroad were obtained from the American Foreign Students (AFS) office in the Southern Orange County area and the California State University, Fullerton Study Abroad program. Letters of introduction together with 79 questionnaires were mailed to students on these lists. Approximately one week after the questionnaires were mailed, the subjects were phoned and asked to participate in the study. Messages were left for subjects when they could not be contacted. Of the 79 questionnaires mailed, 60 were returned, a 76% response rate. Six of the surveys were not used in this study as they were

returned extremely late.

The sample was composed of 21 males and 33 females 19 to 25 years old, with a mean age of 21. The time the individuals had been in the host country ranged from two months to two years, with the average time being one year.

Variables and Measures

The instrument the respondents completed was composed of four scales each designed to measure seperate variables in the study. The response categories for all scales consisted of a Likert-type 7-point scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree (Very Dissatisfied) to 7 = Strongly Agree (Very Satisfied).

The questions in the reentry scale were compiled based on previous research (Austin, 1986; Church, 1982; Freedman, 1986; Koester,1985; Martin,1984; Sussman, 1986; Uehara, 1986). The items comprising the instrument are reported in Table 1. The average score for the reentry shock scale was 4.4 (Md = 4.3; SD = .96) with an alpha coefficient of .83. The 16 item reentry scale comprised the middle third of the measure.

Insert Table 1 about here

Locus of control for affiliation beliefs were measured using Lefcourt's Multi-dimensional-Multi-attributional Causality Scale for affiliation. The 24 items that comprise the scale are divided into four sets of attributions: ability; effort; contextual characteristics; and luck. One subscale measures internality, the other measures externality. The subscales comprising the internal scale, Ability and Effort resulted in average scores of 3.8 (Md= 4.0;

SD= 1.23 with an alpha coefficient of .68, and 4.7 (Md= 4.8; SD= .92 with an alpha coefficient of .57) respectively. The average scores for the subscales comprising the external scale, Luck and Context were 3.2 (Md=3.2; SD= 1.08 with an alpha coefficient of .68), and 3.9 (Md= 3.8; SD= .97 with an alpha coefficient of .54) respectively. Total internality average was 4.3 (Md= 4.2; SD= .97 with an alpha coefficient of .76). Total externality average was3.5 (Md= 3.4; SD= .89 with an alpha coefficient of .73).

It was determined that the use of the MMCS might prove to be more useful for an examination of the communication in the reentry process as the scale for affiliation is more goal specific (with questions focusing more on affiliation and social attachment) than a general locus of control scale. A more detailed description of the MMCS can be found in Lefcourt (1981) which reports the construction process.

Measurement of the functions of communication was accomplished using Rubin et al.'s(1987) measure for Interpersonal Communication Uses. This measure consists of a 28-item scale. These items were interspersed among the items which comprise the MMCS resulting in a 52-item scale measuring both locus of control for affiliation, and interpersonal uses for communication. The ICU scale results in measures of six items : relaxation , escape, pleasure,inclusion, affection, and control. The average scores for the ICU scales were: relaxation 4.4 (Md.= 4.5; SD.= 1.12 with an alpha coefficient of .76); escape 3.3 (Md.=3.4; SD=1.34) with an alpha coefficient of .80; pleasure 5.6 (Md= 5.6; SD= .89) with an alpha coefficient of .88; inclusion 4.7 (Md.= 5.0; SD.= 1.16 with an alpha coefficient of.71); affection 5.6 (Md.= 5.7; SD.= .84 with an alpha coefficient of .78); and control 3.1 (Md.= 3.0; SD.=1.3 with an alpha coefficient of .68).

Additionally, items following the reentry scale in the measure were added to measure the overall relational satisfaction reported by the individual. The items forming the general relational satisfaction scale were adapted from Martin (1984). The average score for the satisfaction scale was 6.0 (Md. = 6.2; SD. = .87) with an alpha coefficient of .74.

Results

The Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test the hypotheses. The correlations testing the associations hypothesized are presented in Table 2. Table 2 indicates that reentry shock is not associated with either internal or external locus of control. Thus, our first and second hypotheses were not confirmed.

Insert Table 2 about here

The associations postulated by our third hypothesis were confirmed. The correlation coefficient revealed significant associations between internality and the following interpersonal uses for communication : relaxation; inclusion; affection; and control. Externality was also associated with particular interpersonal uses of communication although only two of them; relaxation and control were similar to the uses of communication by those with internal locus of control for affiliation beliefs. The only other item externals used for interpersonal communication was escape. The correlation coefficients also revealed that reentry shock is associated with particular uses of communication in two areas (thus supporting the fourth hypothesis in this study). Reentry shock was associated with communication for pleasure and for affection.

Finally, the only significant negative correlation revealed was between reentry shock and the satisfaction scale. This confirms the fifth

hypothesis, i.e., reentry shock is associated with relational satisfaction.

Discussion

The goal of this study was to explore the reentry process as experienced by American students. This was accomplished by examining the relationships among locus of control, reentry shock, interpersonal uses of communication, and general relational satisfaction. This study sought only to determine if there are relationships between particular constructs. As such, no causal links can be specified, only speculation pertaining to the underlying links can be made. The results of the study reveal some interesting findings.

Although the literature indicates a possible relationship between locus of control and reentry shock, the results do not support the first two hypotheses of this study. Reentry was not associated with either internal or external locus of control in this study. It is possible that these insignificant results are rooted in sojourners' perception of reentry as stressful. Research on stress and locus of control has determined empirically that stressful events cause change which demands readjusment of individuals' normal life patterns (Johnson & Sarason,1978; Kobasa,1979). There may have been individuals in the study who perceived the reentry process as a positive life change. For instance, some studies have indicated that for many individuals, positive life change is not perceived as stressful (Johnson & Sarason, 1978; Mechanic, 1975; Vinokur & Selzer, 1975). This may have some support in the reentry literature. Several researchers have characterized the reentry process as containing positive aspects (as well as the usual difficulties) for the returning sojourner (Martin, 1984; Ruben & Kealey, 1979; Uehara, 1986). Researchers have also reported that reentry shock can lead to improved interpersonal skills (James, 1976), improved

relationships with family members (Martin, 1984), and even increased intrapersonal knowledge (Martin, 1984). However, the findings in this area of research are somewhat inconclusive because the concept of positive attitude change as one result of an indivudual's sojourn has been claimed but not empirically supported (Koester, 1985).

It is also possible that the lack of congruence between the literature that suggests a relationship and the actual results could be the result of methodological problems. The life stress/locus of control studies (mentioned above) used Rotter's locus of control scale, which is a more general measure of locus of control than Lefcourt's MMCS (which was used in this study). Perhaps relationships between locus of control and reentry were not found because the MMCS for affiliation simply measured elements that are germaine to affiliation, but not to life stress or locus of control overall. Thus, it may be that the majority of the individuals in our sample did not perceive the reentry experience as a negative life change. However, regardless of previous research linking locus of control, life stress, and reentry shock, the results of this study seem to indicate that locus of control for affiliation is not related to reentry shock.

The results of this study also revealed that individuals' locus of control beliefs for affiliation were moderately associated with the interpersonal uses for communication, confirming the third hypothesis. Scores for individuals with an internal locus of control were moderately associated with communication for inclusion and affection. A context specific confirmation of Rubin et al., this finding suggests that individuals with an internal orientation need to feel included and express affection, and they will talk to others for this reason. This is also consistent with research which argues that Internals have a "strong tendency toward active involvement with the environment" (Kobasa, 1979, p.9). Individuals with an

internal locus of control orientation may be involving themselves in communication situations attempting to gain control, as they perceive that the actual course of anything (e.g., an improvement in their reentry situation) is dependent on how they handle the situation. In contrast, the scores for those with an external orientation were not associated with inclusion and affection.

In addition to above associations between internal locus of control, affection, and inclusion as functions of communication, there was a strong relationship between the scores for external locus of control and communication for escape, the scores accounting for approximately 20.3 % of the variance. This was unique to external locus of control, and may be consistent with Kobasa's (1979) suggestion that individuals with an external locus of control live with the conviction that life situations have been externally determined with no possibility for control on their part. It is possible that externals are communicating to escape what they perceive as unpleasant as they do not think that they can affect any kind of change. This also seems to have support from a hedonistic perspective (Hecht, 1978). The argument that people seek that which is pleasurable, and avoid that which is painful seems to provide further support for our previous hypothesis: individuals with an internal orientation and individuals with an external orientation use communication for their own particular needs.

Finally, with respect to internal and external locus of control and functions of communication, external locus of control and internal locus of control both positively correlate with communication for relaxation and control. That individuals with an external locus of control orientation would communicate for control seems inconconsistent with previous literature on locus of control. Although the coefficient of determination was slightly higher for the relationship between internal locus of control

and communication for control (8.4 %), it was not significantly larger than the score for the relationship between external locus of control and communication for control (6.9 %). The findings reveal that individuals with an external orientation are communicating for control, escape, and relaxation, but not for inclusion or affection. These correlations may be the result of individuals' desire to avoid more interpersonal interaction with other individuals (reflected by the lack of correlation for affiliation and affection), but the evidence is inconclusive on this supposition. Some research has revealed that individuals with internal locus of control orientations and extrnal locus of control orientations both try to exert control over their environment, but do so in different ways. Weisz, Rothbaum, and Blackburn (1984) argue that control can be conceptualized as either primary or secondary. Active attempts to gain control of ones' environment (which is associated with internally oriented people) would be an example of the use of primary control. Behaviors that researchers have typically classified as signs of relinquished control (aligning oneself with fate, which is associated with externally oriented people), would involve secondary control. This indicates that given the proper circumstances, people with an external locus of control do try to control their environment.

Furthermore, an examination of the Rubin et al. measure could reveal a lack of specificity with regard to primary and secondary control. The lack of differentiation could allow individuals who use one aspect of control rather than the other to score significantly on total use of control. While this study does not allow for an explication of the literature on primary and secondary control, further research on the relationship between functions of communication and locus of control could reveal findings significant for both areas of research. The measure used for locus of control could also have affected the results of the study as Lefcourt's (1981) MMCS

conceptualizes locus of control as being multidimensional allowing for individuals to posess both internal and external beliefs. Rotter's measure (1966) conceptualized locus of control as more unidimensional and was used in many of the studies cited in the literature review. Therefore, further research in this area is needed to reveal more specific findings answering questions pertaining to the relationship of locus of control and functions of communication raised by this study.

This study also found that there is a moderate positive relationship between reentry shock and both pleasure and affection with a coefficient of determination of 10% and 5% respectively. In terms of the findings in regard to the relationship between reentry shock pleasure and affection, there may be two possible reasons for this relationship. First, it is possible that the way individuals use their communication could determine whether they experience reentry shock. For example, it could be that individuals who communicate for pleasure and affection find that when they return to their home culture their communication with friends and family that was pleasurable and affectionate before they left has become uncomfortable and distant. Thus, it is possible that the sojourner first seeks communication for pleasure and to express affection, but if interaction with others is unpleasant, due to value changes in the sojourner (Brein & David, 1971; Gama & Pederson,1977), alienation increases thereby increasing reentry shock. Alternatively, it could be that individuals first experience reentry shock and then begin to communicate for pleasure and affection. This suggests that as individuals' reentry shock increases individuals increasingly communicate to seek pleasure and to express affection. The reason for this could be that reentry shock has caused such extreme discomfort that individuals perceive that pleasurable and affectionate communication could help alleviate the discomfort. Although

consistent with the literature, without causal analysis, it is difficult to make strong statements supporting this supposition. Future research could examine these possibilities.

This study also found a statistically significant negative correlation between relational satisfaction and reentry shock. The correlation is moderate and accounts for approximately 18% of the variance. This supports our final hypothesis and suggests that, as individuals experience more reentry shock, their general relational satisfaction decreases. Considering the probability that the reentry process is seen as primarily a negative life change, Hecht (1978) provides one perspective, again, from the hedonistic viewpoint: satisfaction is the result of successfully avoiding pain, and finding pleasure. This provides support for the research presented earlier and affirms our final hypothesis, which asserts that there is a negative correlation between relational satisfaction and reentry shock (Martin, 1984; Uehara, 1986). The more reentry shock a person is experiencing , the more dissatisfied they are with their relationships in general.

Conclusion

This study only begins to examine the relationship between and among reentry shock, locus of control, interpersonal uses of communication, and relational satisfaction as part of the reentry process. While it provides new information pertaining to the reentry process and the interpersonal uses of communication it is limited in its scope for several reasons.

First, although reentry is a long process, we examined only a portion of this process. The data for this study was gathered at one point rather than at several points during the reentry process. Additionally, the small sample size allows for a larger sampling error, thus preventing us from using more powerful statistical analysis tools to gain information. Moreover, we used

self-reporting mailed questionnaires for this study. This method of data collection has been criticized for several of its weaknesses (Kerlinger, 1986, p. 380), but an analysis the questionnaire format is beyond the scope of this paper.

A further weakness of our study was the lack of a control group for comparison. This was not a strong limitation in itself, but a comparison of data between groups, as implemented in Uehara's study (1986) might have yielded some interesting information about the effects of the reentry experience specifically. Last, the use of a culture specific group (American students) was a limitation only in the sense that it prevented information revealed about the reentry process from being generalized to the international population.

While there were some weaknesses in this study, it did provide new information regarding the intercultural reentry process for American students and interpersonal uses of communication. Although the sample was culture specific, the study did fill a need to gain information pertaining to the reentry process of the large number of students returning to the United States every year from abroad. In doing so, the study answers the call for research in reentry that takes a communication perspective. It also provides empirical data pertinent to interpersonal uses of communication, locus of control, and relational satisfaction. These data hint at possible directions for exploration to determine particular causal links between the constructs.

It is hoped that further research can help to eliminate some of the limitations of this study. A larger sample size will allow the use of more powerful tools of analysis. Further item analysis needs to be done to examine the causal links in the relationships revealed by the data. A more detailed item analysis of the relationship between reentry shock and

pleasure and affection, or locus of control and particular functions of communication may yield answers unobtainable through simple correlation testing. Demographic and biographical data is also available which will allow for specific types of variable analysis using gender, length of stay in host country, and age.

Furthermore, a culturally varied sample could provide some interesting data. The locus of control construct has already been used cross-culturally with interesting results (Fleming & Spooner, 1985; McGinnis et al., 1974; Wheeless et al., 1986). The Interpersonal Uses for Communication measure, could be adapted for cross-cultural research. This would add a specific measure of communication to the tools already employed by cross cultural researchers.

Noting that the reentry process is a part of the entire cross-cultural adjustment process, Martin (1984) makes the point that research in reentry should attempt to examine the entire adjustment process. This means running a longitudinal study that allows for an exploration of the process from predeparture through reentry is necessary. Nevertheless, our examination of one part of the reentry process has revealed information that has contributed to our understanding of this process.

References

Austin, C. N. (1983). Cross-cultural reentry : An annotated bibliography. Abilene, Texas : Abilene Christian University Press.

Brein, M., & David, K. H. (1971). Intercultural communication and the adjustment of the sojourner. Psychological Bulletin, 76, 215-230.

Church, A. (1982). Sojourner adjustment. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 540-572.

Fleming, J.S. & Spooner, P.S. (1985). Five factor scales for internal-external control and their relations to measures of adjustment. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 41, p.512-517.

Freedman, A. (1986). A strategy for managing cultural transitions : Reentry from training. In C.N. Austin (Ed.), Cross cultural reentry : A book of readings (pp. 19-27). Abilene, Texas : Abilene Christian University Press.

Gama, E. M. P., & Pedersen, P. (1977). Readjustment problems of Brazilian returnees from graduate studies in the United States. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1, 46-58.

Hecht, M.L. (1978). Toward a conceptualization of communication satisfaction. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 64, p.47-62.

James, N.E. (1976). Students abroad : Expectations versus reality. Liberal Education, 62, 599-607.

Jansson, D. P. (1986). Return to society : Problematic features of the reentry process. In C.N. Austin (Ed.), Cross cultural reentry process : A book of readings (pp.49-57). Abilene, Texas : Abilene Christian University Press.

Johnson, J. H. & Sarason, I. G. (1978). Life stress, depression and anxiety : Internal-External control as a moderator variable. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 22, p. 205-208.

Johnson, J. H. & Sarason, I. G. (1978). Recent developments in research on life stress. In V. Hamilton & D. M. Warburton (Eds.), Human stress and cognition : An informational processing approch. New York: Wiley.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: College Publishing.

Kobasa, S. C. (1979). Stressful life events, personality, and health: An inquiry into hardiness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1-11.

Koester, J. (May, 1983). Intercultural reentry from the viewpoint of communication. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Dallas, Texas.

Lefcourt, J.M. (1981). The construction and development of the multidimentional multiattributional causality scales. In H.M. Lefcourt (Ed.), Research with the locus of control construct (vol. 1) : Assessment methods (pp.245-275). New York : Academic.

Lefcourt, H. M., Hogg, E., Struthers, S., & Holmes C. (1975). Causal attributions as a function of locus of control, initial confidence, and performance outcomes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, p. 391-397.

Lefcourt, H. M., Miller, R. S., Ware, E. E., & Sherk, D. (1981). Locus of control as a modifier of the relationship between stressors and moods. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 357-369.

McGinnies, E.; Nordholm, L.A.; Ward, C.D.; & Bhanthumnavin, D.L. (1974). Sex and cultural differences in perceived locus of control among students in five countries. Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 42, 451-455.

Martin, J. (1984). The intercultural reentry : conceptualizations and directions for future research. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8, 115-134.

Mechanic, D. (1975). Some problems in the measurement of stress and social readjustment. Journal of Human Stress, 1, 43-48.

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectencies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, p. 9-26.

Rubin, B.D. & Kealey, D.J. (1979). Behavioral assesment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 3, 15-47.

Rubin, R., Perse, E., & Barbato, C.,. (1987). Interspersonal uses of communication. Paper presented to theinternational Communication Association, Montreal, Canada.

Schutz, W. C. (1966). The Interpersonal Underworld. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books.

Uehara, A. (1986). The nature of American student reentry adjustment and perceptions of the sojourn experience. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 415-438.

Vinokur, A. & Selzer, M.L. (1975). Desirable versus undesirable life events : Their relationship to stress and mental distress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 329-337.

Werkman, S.L. (1986). Coming home : adjustmentof Americans to the United States after living abroad. In C.N. Austin (Ed.) Cross Cultural Reentry : A book of readings (pp.5-17). Abiline, Texas : Abiline Christian University Press.

Weisz, J.R., Rothbaum, F.M. & Blackburn, T.C. (1984). Standing out and standing in : The psychology of control in America and Japan. American Psychologist, 39, 955-969.

Wheeless, L.R.; Erickson, K.V.; & Behrens, J.S. (1986). Cultural differences in disclosiveness as a function of locus of control. Communication Monographs, 53, 36-47.

Table 1

Reentry Shock Scale

1.[a] When I returned people did not seem that much interested in my experiences abroad.

2.[b] Life was more exciting in the host culture.

3.[c] My freinds seem to have changed since I have been gone.

4.[d] When I returned home I felt really depressed.

5.[e] I had difficulty adjusting to my home culture after returning from abroad.

6.[f] Since I have been abroad I have become more critical of my home culture's values.

7.[g] I miss the foreign culture where I stayed.

8.[h] I had alot of contact with members of the host culture.

9.[i] I feel like I have changed alot because of my experiences abroad.

10.[j] When I returned home I felt generally alienated.

11.[k] My friends and I have grown in separate directions since I have returned.

12.[l] Life in my home culture is boring after the excitement of living abroad.

13[m] I miss the friends that I made in the host culture.

(table continues)

Table 1

Reentry Shock Scale

14.[n] Since I have been abroad I have become more critical of my home cultures government.
15.[o] My friends and family have pressured me to "fit in" upon returning home.
16.[p] The values and beliefs of the host culture are very different from those of my home culture.

[a] Sussman, 1986. [b]Austin, 1986;Werkman, 1986. [c]Freedman, 1986. [d]Church 1982; Uehara, 1986. [e]Martin, 1984; Gama & Pederson, 1977; Brein & David, 1971; Uehara, 1986. [f]Uehara, 1986. [g]Austin, 1986; Werkman, 1986. [h]Church, 1982; Martin, 1984. [i]Martin, 1984; Uehara, 1986. [j]Church, 1982; Freedman 1986; Werkman, 1986. [k]Freedman, 1986; Uehara, 1986; Church, 1982. [l]Austin, 1986; Werkman, 1986. [m]Austin, 1986; Werkman, 1986. [n]Uehara, 1986. [o]Church, 1982; Freedman, 1986. [p]Martin, 1984.

Table 2

Pearson Correlations

	Reentry	Internal	External	Satisfaction
Reentry	1.0000	.0878 P= .264	-.0086 P= .475	-.4207 P= .001
Relax	.1063 P= .222	.2487 P= .035	.2285 P= .048	.0500 P= .360
Escape	-.0505 P= .358	.0593 P= .335	.4516 P= .000	.2182 P= .056
Pleasure	.3216 P= .009	.1848 P= . 090	-.0457 P= .371	.1171 P= .200
Inclusion	.0354 P= .400	.2935 P= .016	.1833 P= .092	.1286 P= .177
Affection	.2231 P= .052	.2903 P= .017	-.1680 P= .112	-.1306 P= .173
Control	.0752 P= .294	.2903 P= .017	.2634 P= .027	-.2466 P= .036